

Large- N Random Matrix Gravity and the Double Hierarchy Problem

Nima Khosravi^{1,*}

¹*Department of Physics, Shahid Beheshti University, G.C., Evin, Tehran 19839, Iran*

(Dated: April 3, 2020)

Why are the cosmological constant, electroweak and Planck scales so different? This “double hierarchy” problem, where $\Lambda \ll M_{EW}^2 \ll M_p^2$, is one of the most pressing in fundamental physics. We show that in a theory of N randomly coupled massive gravitons at the electroweak scale, these scales are linked precisely by such a double hierarchy for large N , with intriguing cosmological consequences. Surprisingly only one massless graviton emerges which is also the only one that is coupled to matter, giving rise to standard Einstein gravity, with $M_p^2 G_{\mu\nu} = T_{\mu\nu}$ at large N . In addition there is a tower of massive gravitons, the lightest of which can drive late-time acceleration. In this scenario, the observed empirical relation $\Lambda M_p^2 \sim M_{EW}^4$ as well as the double hierarchy, arise naturally since $\Lambda \sim M_{EW}^2/\sqrt{N}$ and $M_p^2 \sim \sqrt{N}M_{EW}^2$.

Introduction: In this Letter, a model is proposed to connect two main hierarchy problems in theoretical physics, the electroweak and the cosmological constant, by using Random Matrix Theory for the gravitational sector. The Einstein-Hilbert action naturally emerges with the coupling to matter at Planck scale, M_p^2 . In addition, a tower of massive graviton without any interaction with visible matter is predicted which can also be a resolution for the hierarchy problems. This tower of massive gravitons can describe the dark sector of our universe with their own cosmological footprints. We emphasize that our idea could be applied to other fields of physics but here we focus on the gravitational sector. Now let us review the status of our understanding of the gravitational interaction before presenting the main idea.

The Einstein-Hilbert action describes our gravitational sector very successfully. Theoretically, it predicts a massless spin-2 particle, graviton, as the mediator of the gravitational field. Its coupling to matter is extraordinarily weak, given by the inverse Planck mass squared, $1/M_p^2$. On the other hand, (observable) matter content of the universe is described by the standard model of particle physics at electroweak energy scale, M_{EW}^2 . The gap between these two energy scales is huge and is one of the famous hierarchy problems formulated in theoretical physics. On the other hand, cosmological observations support a model which is almost dark. Dark matter is needed for structure formation as well as describing the cosmic microwave background and up to now there is no hint for their direct detections. The nature of dark energy, Λ , which is responsible for the late time accelerating phase of the universe is almost unknown. The existence of a non-zero but very tiny Λ causes a new hierarchy between involved energy scales in the universe as $\Lambda \ll M_{EW}^2 \ll M_p^2$. It is worth to mention here that there is a very peculiar empirical relation between these energy scales, “ $\Lambda M_p^2 \sim M_{EW}^4$ ”, without any theoretical justification.

On the other hand there is always the question that whether our universe could be in another form. This question can be asked if it is possible to describe our own universe with its current physics starting from a random framework? This

brings the well-known theory of random matrix theory (RMT) to our mind. Wigner introduced random matrices in nuclear physics [1] but the influential works have been done by Dyson [2]. The applications of RMT are widespread from quantum chaos [3] to quantum gravity [4]. This field was also studied in pure mathematics. For our purpose it is specially useful to mention two seminal theorems in this field. First, the eigenvalue spectrum of an $N \times N$ random matrix has a maximum eigenvalue at $\mathcal{O}(N/2)$ while the other smaller eigenvalues are distributed in Wigner’s semi-circle $[-\sqrt{N}, \sqrt{N}]$ [5]. Second, the Perron-Frobenius theorem states that for an $N \times N$ matrix with positive real components there is a largest eigenvalue whose corresponding eigenvector has all positive components and it is not true for any other eigenvectors.

In a promising work, Sachdev and Ye in [6] studied a network of spins where the couplings are chosen from a random distribution. Kitaev generalized their idea [7], nowadays well-known as SYK model, which has been shown that has relations to the black-hole entropy and AdS/CFT correspondence [8]. In SYK model the Hamiltonian for N Majorana fermions, ψ_i ’s, is written as $H = \sum_{ijkl} \gamma_{ijkl} \psi_i \psi_j \psi_k \psi_l$ where the couplings γ_{ijkl} are taken randomly from a Gaussian distribution. The final result in SYK model has a $1/N$ expansion where the zeroth order term is uniquely determined for large N limit independent of the initially randomly chosen γ_{ijkl} [8].

Inspired by the above idea, in this Letter we will study a multi-massive-graviton model¹, where all the couplings are taken from a random distribution. It will be shown that the results are promising: i) we can answer why Einstein-Hilbert action governs the gravitational force in our universe², ii) our model gives a theoretical justification for $\Lambda M_p^2 \sim M_{EW}^4$ which makes two independent hierarchy problems one, iii) in addition we predict a tower of massive gravitons³ between Λ and M_p^2 which can be interpreted as dark sector due to their

¹ It is well-known that gravity cannot be explained by a scalar or a vector field. This means having N spin-2 particle can be interpreted as the most general scenario for describing gravitational field.

² This question has been studied in [9, 10] but by a different viewpoint.

³ This property of our model, i.e. having large number of new degrees of freedom, is very similar to what has been studied in [11–13] in other contexts.

*Electronic address: n-khosravi@sbu.ac.ir

lack of interaction with visible matter.

The Multi-Graviton Model: The (generalized) quadratic Lagrangian for N massive spin-2 particles can be written as perturbations of the metric around the Minkowski⁴ one, $g_{\mu\nu}^{(i)} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + h_{\mu\nu}^{(i)}$, as

$$\mathcal{S} = \int dx^4 \left[M^2 \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \left(K_{ij} h_{\mu\nu}^{(i)} \mathcal{E}^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} h_{\alpha\beta}^{(j)} \right) \right. \\ \left. + M^4 \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{m}_{ij} V(h_{\mu\nu}^{(i)}, h_{\alpha\beta}^{(j)}) + \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i h_{\mu\nu}^{(i)} T^{\mu\nu} \right] \quad (1)$$

where $\mathcal{E}^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}$ is Lichnerowicz (second order differential) operator. We also assumed mixing kinetic terms (by non vanishing off-diagonal terms of K_{ij}) which makes the above Lagrangian more general than the usual one⁵. In the above Lagrangian K_{ij} and \tilde{m}_{ij} are $\mathcal{O}(1)$ dimensionless coefficients and we emphasize that there is just one mass scale, M^2 , in this action. The last term shows the coupling between gravity and matter sectors and we assume all α_i 's are $\mathcal{O}(1)$ quantities. The form of mass term is given to be $h_{\mu\nu}^{(i)} - h_{\mu\nu}^{(j)}$ by the fully non-linear ghost free dRGT massive gravity [15] though it has been suggested firstly in [16]. At the quadratic level V_{dRGT} reduces to

$$V(h_{\mu\nu}^{(i)} - h_{\mu\nu}^{(j)}) \propto \\ \left(\eta^{\mu\alpha} \eta^{\nu\beta} - \eta^{\mu\nu} \eta^{\alpha\beta} \right) (h_{\mu\nu}^{(i)} - h_{\mu\nu}^{(j)}) (h_{\alpha\beta}^{(i)} - h_{\alpha\beta}^{(j)}) \quad (2)$$

which reduces to Fierz-Pauli mass term if we have one dynamical metric. The above property, i.e., the appearance of $h_{\mu\nu}^{(i)} - h_{\mu\nu}^{(j)}$ in the mass term clarifies that for N independent metrics we can only have at most $N - 1$ independent building blocks in the mass term. So without any loss of generality we can write the mass term in matrix notation as

$$\Delta \mathbf{h}^T \cdot \mathbb{M} \cdot \Delta \mathbf{h} \quad (3)$$

where

$$\mathbb{M} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & m_{11} & m_{12} & \dots & m_{1,N-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & m_{21} & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & m_{N-1,1} & \dots & \dots & m_{N-1,N-1} \end{pmatrix}_{N \times N} \quad (4)$$

and

$$\Delta \mathbf{h} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} X_{\mu\nu} \\ h_{\mu\nu}^{(1)} - h_{\mu\nu}^{(2)} \\ h_{\mu\nu}^{(2)} - h_{\mu\nu}^{(3)} \\ \vdots \\ h_{\mu\nu}^{(N-1)} - h_{\mu\nu}^{(N)} \end{pmatrix}_{N \times 1} \quad (5)$$

and we have introduced $X_{\mu\nu}$ which has no contribution in mass term⁶. In the matrix language we can also write the kinetic term as

$$\mathbf{h}^T \cdot \mathbb{K} \cdot \mathbf{h} \quad (6)$$

where

$$\mathbb{K} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} K_{11} & K_{12} & \dots & \dots & K_{1N} \\ K_{21} & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ K_{N1} & \dots & \dots & \dots & K_{NN} \end{pmatrix}_{N \times N} \quad (7)$$

and

$$\mathbf{h} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} h_{\mu\nu}^{(1)} \\ h_{\mu\nu}^{(2)} \\ h_{\mu\nu}^{(3)} \\ \vdots \\ h_{\mu\nu}^{(N)} \end{pmatrix}_{N \times 1} \quad (8)$$

Random Kinetic and Mass Matrices: We would like to assume that the components of the kinetic and mass matrices are random numbers belong to $[0, 1]$. This means that there is no priory assumption for these matrices and all of the coefficients in (1) are at order $\mathcal{O}(1)$, i.e., they are natural⁷. For the first step let's focus on the kinetic term (7) and try to make it diagonal. Füredi-Komlós theorem emphasizes that for an $N \times N$ matrix with random components in $[0, 1]$ there is just one very large eigenvalue, $\lambda_0 \sim \frac{\mathcal{O}(N)}{2}$, when the other eigenvalues, $\lambda_{i \neq 0}$'s, are distributed around zero on Wigner semi-circle with radius $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{N})$. So for large N 's we have $|\lambda_{i \neq 0}| \ll \lambda_0$. The key property of the largest eigenvalue, λ_0 , is that the components of its eigenvector are all positive and it is not true for other λ_i 's eigenvectors according to Perron-Frobenius theorem. By diagonalizing the kinetic matrix using the matrix of eigenvectors we get

$$\mathcal{L}_{kin} = M^2 \left[N E_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{E}^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} E_{\alpha\beta} + \sqrt{N} g_{\mu\nu}^{(1)} \mathcal{E}^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} g_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)} \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{i=2}^{N-1} \mu_i(N) g_{\mu\nu}^{(i)} \mathcal{E}^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} g_{\alpha\beta}^{(i)} \right]$$

⁴ Our analysis can be easily generalized to a general background metric $\bar{g}_{\mu\nu}$.

⁵ We only assume that K_{ij} is positive definite. This assumption guarantees that all the eigenvalues are positive and consequently the kinetic term does not produce any ghosts.

⁶ Note that here we assumed a line graph for $h_{\mu\nu}^{(i)}$'s. However it has been shown that the ghost-free (multi) massive gravity can be realized in a more general for of a tree graph. But for our purposes there is no difference between these two choices since we can always change the coordinate to make a tree graph to a line graph. The price is changing in kinetic matrix \mathbb{K} which will remain a random matrix. So there will be no modification in our results.

⁷ Note that it is easy to see that the main results are not changed if one define natural parameters e.g. in $[0.1, 10]$ instead of $[0, 1]$. The only difference is that a factor of ~ 10 should be multiplied to eigenvalues. Note that one can also change uniform distribution $[0, 1]$ to a Gaussian one and if the mean and variance be $\mathcal{O}(1)$ the results are not modified for large N 's which is our goal in this work.

where $\mu_i(N)$ are decreasing faster than \sqrt{N} . In the above Lagrangian $E_{\mu\nu}$ corresponds to the largest eigenvalue and $g_{\mu\nu}^{(i)}$'s are related to smaller eigenvalues. For future purposes we picked out $g_{\mu\nu}^{(1)}$ which corresponds to the second largest eigenvalue, i.e., $\sim \sqrt{N}$. As we mentioned previously, the eigenvector's components of the largest eigenvalue are all positive which means $E_{\mu\nu} = \sum_{i=1}^N a_i h_{\mu\nu}^{(i)}$ where $a_i > 0$.

It is time to use the eigenvector matrix of kinetic matrix to write mass term by $E_{\mu\nu}$ and $g_{\mu\nu}^{(i)}$ instead of $h_{\mu\nu}^{(i)}$ fields. The first key point here is that since the mass term is an independent random matrix, the new mass term will not be affected qualitatively and all its components are expected to be at $\mathcal{O}(1)$. The more important and crucial property for the new mass term is as follows: as we already mentioned, the mass term is written as the $h_{\mu\nu}^{(i)} - h_{\mu\nu}^{(i+1)}$ combination [15, 16]. It is easy to prove that $E_{\mu\nu} = \sum_{i=1}^N a_i h_{\mu\nu}^{(i)}$ cannot be written as $\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} b_i (h_{\mu\nu}^{(i)} - h_{\mu\nu}^{(i+1)})$ when $a_i > 0$. On the other hand by construction $E_{\mu\nu}$ cannot be written as $\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} c_i g_{\mu\nu}^{(i)}$ due to orthonormality of eigenvectors of a matrix. This means we can write all the $h_{\mu\nu}^{(i)} - h_{\mu\nu}^{(i+1)}$ in terms of $g_{\mu\nu}^{(i)}$'s. Consequently, one of the main properties of our model is that $E_{\mu\nu}$ is massless⁸. We can explain this property by thinking that if we could repeat, many times, the above procedure to get $E_{\mu\nu}$ then we expect to have $E_{\mu\nu} \propto \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} g_{\mu\nu}^{(i)}$ i.e. all the $g_{\mu\nu}^{(i)}$ should have the same contribution in $E_{\mu\nu}$ since for a random matrix we do not expect any difference between $g_{\mu\nu}^{(i)}$'s.

In this new coordinate the coupling to matter i.e. $\sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i h_{\mu\nu}^{(i)} T^{\mu\nu}$ in (1) should be rewritten too. To have no priority between $h_{\mu\nu}^{(i)}$'s we have assumed all α_i 's are at the same order $\mathcal{O}(1)$. Let's recall that $E_{\mu\nu} = \sum_{i=1}^N a_i h_{\mu\nu}^{(i)}$ and the a_i 's are the components of the eigenvector with the largest eigenvalue and a_i 's are all positive. Note that the eigenvectors are orthonormal so $\sum_{i=1}^N a_i^2 = 1$ and for large N we expect to have all a_i 's at the same order $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{N})$. Then it is easily understood that $\sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i h_{\mu\nu}^{(i)} T^{\mu\nu} \sim \sqrt{N} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N a_i h_{\mu\nu}^{(i)} \right) T^{\mu\nu} = \sqrt{N} E_{\mu\nu} T^{\mu\nu}$ which is exact⁹ for very large N .

Emerged gravity model from large- N coupled gravitons: The final results of the above analysis will be presented by combining the mass and kinetic terms in the new basis. For this purpose we do not consider $\mathcal{O}(1/N)$ and $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{N})$ corrections and later we make comments on them. The La-

grangian (1) in the new basis can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & N M^2 \left[E_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{E}^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} E_{\alpha\beta} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} g_{\mu\nu}^{(1)} \mathcal{E}^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} g_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)} \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{i=2}^{N-1} \frac{\mu_i(N)}{N} g_{\mu\nu}^{(i)} \mathcal{E}^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} g_{\alpha\beta}^{(i)} \right] \\ & + N M^4 \left[\frac{1}{N} g_{\mu\nu}^{(1)} P^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} g_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=2}^{N-1} g_{\mu\nu}^{(i)} P^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} g_{\alpha\beta}^{(i)} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \neq j}^{N-1} g_{\mu\nu}^{(i)} Q^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} g_{\alpha\beta}^{(j)} \right] \\ & + \sqrt{N} E_{\mu\nu} T^{\mu\nu} \end{aligned}$$

where $P^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}$ and $Q^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}$ are representing mass term and the mixing between the different gravitons respectively (and they are given by the background metric $\eta_{\mu\nu}$). By rescaling the metrics, as $g_{\mu\nu}^{(i)} \rightarrow h_{\mu\nu}^{(i)}/\alpha_i(N)$ where $\alpha_i^2(N) = \mu_i(N)/N$ and $\mu_1(N) = \sqrt{N}$, we can make all the kinetic terms canonical

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & N M^2 \left[E_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{E}^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} E_{\alpha\beta} \right. \\ & + \left(h_{\mu\nu}^{(1)} \mathcal{E}^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} h_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)} + M^2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} h_{\mu\nu}^{(1)} P^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} h_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)} \right) \\ & + \sum_{i=2}^{N-1} \left(h_{\mu\nu}^{(i)} \mathcal{E}^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} h_{\alpha\beta}^{(i)} + M^2 \frac{1}{\mu_i(N)} h_{\mu\nu}^{(i)} P^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} h_{\alpha\beta}^{(i)} \right) \\ & + M^2 \sum_{i \neq j}^{N-1} \lambda_{ij} h_{\mu\nu}^{(i)} Q^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} h_{\alpha\beta}^{(j)} \left. \right] \\ & + \sqrt{N} E_{\mu\nu} T^{\mu\nu} \end{aligned}$$

where $1/\lambda_{ij} = \sqrt{\mu_i(N)\mu_j(N)}$. Now the emerged mathematical properties are:

- There is just one *massless* graviton $E_{\mu\nu}$.
- This massless graviton is the one which is coupled to matter.
- There is an infinite tower of massive gravitons with no interaction with matter.
- The mass spectrum has a minimum at $\mu^2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} M^2$ for the metric labeled $h_{\mu\nu}^{(1)}$.

Main Results: The fascinating physics associated with the above mathematical results can be listed as follow

- The massless graviton $E_{\mu\nu}$ emerges automatically and represents standard Einstein-Hilbert action exactly. This metric is the one which is coupled to visible matter.
- The Planck mass is the ratio of the coefficients of kinetic term and coupling term to matter i.e. $M_p^2 \equiv \sqrt{N} M^2$.
- The model automatically gives a minimum energy scale at μ^2 .

⁸ Note that this result is compatible with previous results in multi-massive gravity models [17, 18].

⁹ It is worth to mention for future purposes that the other metrics also can interact with the matter. But it is easy to see that those coefficients are decreasing much faster than $1/N$. The reason is maybe due to the very non-trivial contributions of all randomly distributed initial matrix elements in the procedure of diagonalization. So since all the interaction terms decrease much faster than $1/N$ except one (which is $E_{\mu\nu}$) then we can consistently ignore them.

- A simple algebra shows that $\mu^2 M_p^2 = M^4$. This is an amazing result:

Up to now we haven't said anything about the *only* mass scale in our model, i.e. M^2 , but let's fix it to be the electroweak energy scale $M^2 = M_{EW}^2$. It is shown in the literature that a massive graviton (with small mass) can cause the late time acceleration with a cosmological constant as $\Lambda \sim \mu^2$ [17, 19–22]. So the above relation becomes $\Lambda M_p^2 \sim M_{EW}^4$ which relates the electroweak, Planck and cosmological constant energy scales together. This is an interesting result which relates two (independent) hierarchy problems between “ M_p^2 and M_{EW}^2 ” and “ M_p^2 and Λ ” to just one problem: why N is large? This means the physics of the largest and the smallest energy scales are connected. Note that these two scales emerge from M_{EW}^2 scale naturally. It is worth to mention that $\Lambda M_p^2 \sim M_{EW}^4$ is supported by observations although there was no theoretical justification for it, previously (up to our knowledge).

- In addition, a tower of massive gravitons arise naturally between $[\mu^2, M_p^2]$. This can be seen as a resolution for the hierarchy problem by prediction of new physics between M_{EW}^2 and M_p^2 scales.

In addition to the above main results there are some further implications in our model. They are important and need more considerations in details for future but it is worth to be listed:

- Since the tower of massive gravitons are not coupled to matter they can be interpreted as dark components of the universe i.e. dark matter and dark energy.
- The massive gravitons with masses close to μ^2 are the ones comparable with the inverse Hubble scale. These massive gravitons cannot be localized and results in self-accelerating solutions describing the late time acceleration¹⁰.
- There are many other massive gravitons in this model with the masses above μ^2 which are larger than the inverse Hubble scale which can be interpreted as dark matter particles. It should be mentioned that the massive spin-2 particles as dark matter are suggested and studied in [23–26]. In these works under some assumptions the stability of dark matter particles has been considered. It is concluded that massive spin-2 particles can be a candidate for stable cold dark matter particles. These spin-2 particles can have very small masses but they are not relativistic necessarily due to not contributing in thermal bath. This means they are not constrained by CMB bounds¹¹.

¹⁰ Note that there are many massive gravitons with masses around μ^2 but they may modify the late time cosmological constant just by a factor of 2 or so when we have a line graph for mass term. It is obvious from the results in [17] by assuming $m_3^2 = 0$.

¹¹ The well-known similar scenario is axions, particles that can have mass

Concluding Remarks and Future Perspectives: To recapitulate, it has been shown that from N randomly coupled massive gravitons, at M_{EW}^2 energy scale, the Einstein-Hilbert action (i.e. just one massless graviton) emerges automatically. This massless graviton is the only graviton which couples to matter at M_p^2 energy scale. More interestingly, the empirical relation $\Lambda M_p^2 \sim M_{EW}^4$ finds a theoretical justification in our model. This result amazingly reduces two fundamental hierarchy problems to just one. On the other hand a tower of massive gravitons also emerges naturally such that $m^2 \in [\Lambda, M_p^2]$ which can be a solution for hierarchy problem. In addition the tower of massive gravitons can be responsible for dark sector of our universe.

We believe that Random Matrix Gravity can be a way to think about the hierarchy problems and its outstanding results makes it an interesting model to consider more. One theoretical direction of pursuing is embedding this model into the non-linear multi-graviton models [18, 29–31] which is based on ghost free massive gravity [15, 32]. For this purpose, [33] may be useful where the clockwork idea [34, 35] has been employed for spin-2 particles and its non-linear extension is also studied¹². As it is also stated in [33], there is no radiative instability caused by coupling to matter since there is only one metric which is coupled to matter. However the loops in graviton interactions with each others should be studied which remain for the future works. Another way to think is by looking for a symmetry which is responsible for the absence of any ghost in massive gravity¹³. Then we can impose that symmetry in our commencing Lagrangian (1) to be sure our model is healthy. On the other hand the phenomenology of a tower of spin-2 particles can be very rich in cosmology and the physics of dark matter [23–26] which is also predicted in [33].

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Nima Doroud for his comment on [9] and its possible relation to [8] which became the first step of this work. I am grateful to Shant Baghran, Marzieh Farhang and Shahab Shahidi for fruitful discussions and commenting on the early drafts. I am grateful to Bruce Bassett, Martin Kunz, Johannes Noller and Shahin Sheikh-Jabbari for their comments on the draft. Also I thank Mohsen Amini (Nazanin's father) and Amir Kargaran for their comments on RMT properties. I specially thank Sara Khatibi for her comments on different stages of this work and very fruitful discussions. I am also grateful to the Abdus Salam International Center of Theoretical Physics (ICTP) for their very kind hospitality during the initial steps of this work.

even less than meV energy scale but since they do not have interaction with visible matter, they do not contribute in thermal bath. This makes them non-relativistic even if their masses are very small [27, 28].

¹² We thank Johannes Noller for mentioning these works to us and also the similarity between our model and the clockwork idea.

¹³ For partially massless gravity there are some attempts trying to relate these models to some gauge symmetries [36, 37].

-
- [1] Eugene P. Wigner, *Annals of Mathematics, Second Series*, Vol. 62, No. 3 (Nov., 1955), pp. 548-564
- [2] Dyson, F. J. Statistical Theory of the energy levels of complex systems, I, II, & III, *J. Math. Phys.* v.3 (1962) no.1, 140-175; Dyson, F. J. A Brownian-motion model for the eigenvalues of a random matrix. *J. Math. Phys.* v. 3 (1962) no.6, 1191-1198.; Dyson, F. J. The threefold way. Algebraic structure of symmetry groups and ensembles in quantum mechanics. *J. Math. Phys.* v.3 (1962) no.6, 1199-1215.; Dyson, F. J.; Mehta, M. L. Statistical theory of the energy levels of complex systems. IV. *J. Math. Phys.* v.4 (1963) no.5, 701-712; Mehta, M. L.; Dyson, F. J. Statistical theory of the energy levels of complex systems. V. *J. Math. Phys.* v.4 (1963) no.5, 713-719; Dyson, F. J. Correlations between eigenvalues of a random matrix. *Commun. Math. Phys.* v. 19 (1970) no. 3, 235-250; Dyson, F. J. Fredholm determinants and inverse scattering problems. *Commun. Math. Phys.* v. 47 (1976) no. 2, 171-183.
- [3] Bohigas, O.; Giannoni, M.-J.; Schmit, C. Characterization of chaotic quantum spectra and universality of level fluctuation laws. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* v. 52 (1984), no. 1, 1-4.
- [4] Brezin, E.; Kazakov, V. A. Exactly solvable field theories of closed strings. *Phys. Lett. B* v. 236 (1990) no. 2, 144-150. Gross, D. J.; Migdal, A. A. Nonperturbative two-dimensional quantum gravity. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 64 (1990), no. 2, 127-130. Douglas, M. R.; Shenker, S. H. Strings in less than one dimension. *Nuclear Phys. B* v. 335 (1990), no. 3, 635-654. ; Kontsevich, M. *Commun. Math. Phys.* v. 147 (1992), no. 1, 1-23
- [5] Arnold, L. On Asymptotic Distribution of Eigenvalues of Random Matrices. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* v. 20 (1967) no. 2, 262-?.; Pastur L.A. On the spectrum of random matrices. *Theor. and Math.* 10 (1972), No. 1, 67-74; Furedi, Z.; Komlos, J. The Eigenvalues of Random Symmetric Matrices. *Combinatorica*. v. 1 (1981) no. 3, 233-241.
- [6] Subir Sachdev and Jinwu Ye, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 70, 3339 (1993)
- [7] A. Kitaev, "A simple model of quantum holography", Talks given at "Entanglement in Strongly-Correlated Quantum Matter, KITP, 2015.
- [8] J. Maldacena and D. Stanford, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, no. 10, 106002 (2016) [arXiv:1604.07818 [hep-th]].
- [9] N. Khosravi, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, no. 12, 124035 (2016) [arXiv:1606.01887 [gr-qc]].
- [10] N. Khosravi, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **21**, 21 (2018) [arXiv:1703.02052 [gr-qc]].
- [11] N. Arkani-Hamed, T. Cohen, R. T. D'Agnolo, A. Hook, H. D. Kim and D. Pinner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, no. 25, 251801 (2016) [arXiv:1607.06821 [hep-ph]].
- [12] G. Dvali, *Fortsch. Phys.* **58**, 528 (2010) [arXiv:0706.2050 [hep-th]].
- [13] G. Dvali and M. Redi, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 055001 (2009) [arXiv:0905.1709 [hep-ph]].
- [14] A. Hook, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, no. 26, 261802 (2018) [arXiv:1802.10093 [hep-ph]].
- [15] C. de Rham, G. Gabadadze and A. J. Tolley, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 231101 (2011) [arXiv:1011.1232 [hep-th]].
- [16] N. Arkani-Hamed, H. Georgi and M. D. Schwartz, *Annals Phys.* **305**, 96 (2003) [hep-th/0210184].
- [17] N. Khosravi, N. Rahmanpour, H. R. Sepangi and S. Shahidi, *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 024049 (2012) [arXiv:1111.5346 [hep-th]].
- [18] L. Alberte, C. de Rham, A. Momeni, J. Rumbutis and A. J. Tolley, arXiv:1910.05285 [hep-th].
- [19] A. E. Gumrukcuoglu, C. Lin and S. Mukohyama, *JCAP* **1111**, 030 (2011) [arXiv:1109.3845 [hep-th]].
- [20] D. Comelli, M. Crisostomi, F. Nesti and L. Pilo, *JHEP* **1203**, 067 (2012) Erratum: [*JHEP* **1206**, 020 (2012)] [arXiv:1111.1983 [hep-th]].
- [21] M. S. Volkov, *JHEP* **1201**, 035 (2012) [arXiv:1110.6153 [hep-th]].
- [22] M. von Strauss, A. Schmidt-May, J. Enander, E. Mortsell and S. F. Hassan, *JCAP* **1203**, 042 (2012) [arXiv:1111.1655 [gr-qc]].
- [23] E. Babichev, L. Marzola, M. Raidal, A. Schmidt-May, F. Urban, H. Veerme and M. von Strauss, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, no. 8, 084055 (2016) [arXiv:1604.08564 [hep-ph]].
- [24] E. Babichev, L. Marzola, M. Raidal, A. Schmidt-May, F. Urban, H. Veerme and M. von Strauss, *JCAP* **1609**, 016 (2016) [arXiv:1607.03497 [hep-th]].
- [25] N. L. Gonzalez Albornoz, A. Schmidt-May and M. von Strauss, *JCAP* **1801**, 014 (2018) [arXiv:1709.05128 [hep-th]].
- [26] K. Aoki and S. Mukohyama, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, no. 2, 024001 (2016) [arXiv:1604.06704 [hep-th]].
- [27] D. J. E. Marsh, *Phys. Rept.* **643**, 1 (2016) [arXiv:1510.07633 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [28] L. D. Duffy and K. van Bibber, *New J. Phys.* **11**, 105008 (2009) [arXiv:0904.3346 [hep-ph]]. HEP :: Search :: Help :: Terms of use :: Privacy policy Powered by Invenio v1.1.2+ Problems/Questions to feedback@inspirehep.net
- [29] K. Hinterbichler and R. A. Rosen, *JHEP* **1207**, 047 (2012) [arXiv:1203.5783 [hep-th]].
- [30] J. Noller, J. H. C. Scargill and P. G. Ferreira, *JCAP* **1402**, 007 (2014) [arXiv:1311.7009 [hep-th]].
- [31] J. H. C. Scargill, J. Noller and P. G. Ferreira, *JHEP* **1412**, 160 (2014) [arXiv:1410.7774 [hep-th]].
- [32] S. F. Hassan and R. A. Rosen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 041101 (2012) [arXiv:1106.3344 [hep-th]].
- [33] F. Niedermann, A. Padilla and P. M. Saffin, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, no. 10, 104014 (2018) [arXiv:1805.03523 [hep-th]].
- [34] D. E. Kaplan and R. Rattazzi, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, no. 8, 085007 (2016) [arXiv:1511.01827 [hep-ph]].
- [35] K. Choi and S. H. Im, *JHEP* **1601**, 149 (2016) [arXiv:1511.00132 [hep-ph]].
- [36] L. Apolo and S. F. Hassan, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **34**, no. 10, 105005 (2017) [arXiv:1609.09514 [hep-th]].
- [37] L. Apolo, S. F. Hassan and A. Lundkvist, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, no. 12, 124055 (2016) [arXiv:1609.09515 [hep-th]].